

deal, I'm going to take some of that capital, and I'm going to invest it in another kind of a business where Congress isn't as likely to change the deal.

So when you raise the taxation after the fact and you change the leases and force them to be renegotiated, there will be less exploration dollars going in, which means we'll find less gas and less oil. There will be less on the market, and supply and demand still works in this country. If you have a little bit and a lot of people want it, it will be a high price; and a whole lot of something that not many people want, it'll be a low price. That's the case we have today with the energy prices.

This still is a global market, too. This \$96 oil is out there, and that's the price, not because we set it at that. That's what competition sets the price of oil at. We need more of it on the market. We need more drilling. We need more transportation.

By the way, we need to build those pipelines down from Alberta where they have the tar sands. We have good neighbors to the north with more oil than they know what to do with up there, and they're happy to sell it to us. I'm happy to pipeline it down here and refine it in the United States and refine it up in the neighborhood where I live and distribute that to the rest of the country. That will hold the prices down, Mr. Speaker.

So the points that I came to this floor to make are two big ones. One is producing a gallon of BTUs out of ethanol, out of the equivalent to a gallon of gas, takes less energy than it does to crack a gallon of gas out of a barrel of crude oil. Let's just say that we set a barrel of crude oil up at the refinery in Texas and put your \$96 price on that, by the way. That's what this barrel is worth in the open market, and you set a bushel of corn outside the ethanol plant in, let me say, Marcus, Iowa.

And what's it going to cost to get me a gallon's worth of BTUs? Let me see, a gallon of gasoline is 108,500 BTUs. What's it going to take to get 108,500 BTUs out of this barrel of crude oil, and how many BTUs is that? 1.3 times the amount you get out of it. Thirty percent more BTUs to crack it out than you get out of that gallon of gas, and it takes .67 for every BTU to take that gallon of ethanol that's going to be produced out of that bushel of corn that's sitting outside the plant at Marcus, Iowa.

So when you look at the difference, it can be argued that, yes, it takes energy to turn corn into ethanol, but it can't be argued that it doesn't take energy to turn crude oil into gasoline. And the facts come down to it takes less energy to produce the ethanol BTU equivalent than it does to produce the gasoline BTU equivalent, side by side, bushel of corn sitting at the gate of the ethanol plant in Little Sioux Corn Processors outside of Marcus, Iowa, versus the refinery down in Texas.

And what it really comes back to is we have to have energy put together

and a kind of form that we can use it. We have to be able to transport it, we have to be able to handle it, we have to be able to convert it into heat or kinetic energy. And you can do that with a liquid. Ethanol is a liquid. Gasoline is a liquid. You can do it with a gas.

And I will submit that we have found a way to be able to produce billions of gallons of ethanol, and those numbers are going up; and if they ever level off and stop because this Congress made a turn against the renewable fuels industry, that would be a tragedy for our environment. It would be a tragedy for our economy, and it would cost the United States taxpayers if they were going to continue with the current deal that they have, with the farmers and the producers here in the United States, the numbers that I've given you, the \$6.8 billion last year versus the zero dollars this year, compared to \$3 billion in subsidy. Net savings on the two is \$3.8 billion.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, thanks for recognizing me. I appreciate this privilege and honor.

SINGING THE BLUES

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, radio stations pay a set contract amount for recording label companies to play their songs. Part of that money goes to the writer of the songs for each time the song is aired. But the performers get a set fee from the record label company, no matter how many times their songs are played on the radio.

Now the performers want the Federal Government to charge radio stations a performance fee each time the song is played. That money would go to the performer. In other words, tax radio stations to subsidize the performers because, God bless them, they just don't make enough money.

The Federal Government has no business interfering in the free market and subsidizing performers at taxpayers' expense. The music artists and their agents should work out a better contract with their recording companies.

The proposal to subsidize recording artists would require the cost to be passed on to the consumers by higher advertising fees. Plus, the whole concept smacks in the face of freedom of the airwaves.

The Federal Government needs to stay out of the radio control business, even if performers are just "Singing the Blues."

And that's just the way it is.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once stated, "A democracy can-

not be both ignorant and free." Our Founding Fathers shared that attitude. They knew that if American citizens failed to share information and were unable to speak freely, they would be worse off than they had been as subjects under Britain's King George III.

Our Founding Fathers were former colonists under a tyranny that controlled information and freedom of expression. King George III suppressed free speech, especially speech critical of the Crown or the government.

As the Founding Fathers debated what the new Nation of America should look like and stand for, they were determined free speech would be a basic right for all of us.

After the States ratified the Constitution, our Founding Fathers set out to enact a declaration of rights. They knew that this was essential for our country. That declaration of rights later became the Bill of Rights, which includes the first 10 amendments.

The Bill of Rights, Mr. Speaker, limits government control over us. The government does not have any rights. Government has power. It has the power we give it when we give up our rights that are listed in the Bill of Rights. This is an important concept that unfortunately many Americans fail to understand.

And the first amendment is first because it's the most important. The first amendment states in part: Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.

Without the first amendment of free speech, freedom of the press, religion and assembly, the rest of the amendments are meaningless. The purpose of the first amendment is to permit free and open discussion about important public affairs. This is exactly what was forbidden under King George, so it makes sense that this was most important to our Founders.

The Founding Fathers intended free speech to include criticism of the government and advocacy of unpopular ideas that are distasteful or even against public policy or even controversial issues. Freedom of speech allows individuals to express themselves without interference of the government.

For over 200 years, the first amendment has endured without substantial alterations or limitations. This is a testament to the first amendment's importance. There are a few instances, however, in our history where the first amendment has been set aside, including a few instances of government censorship, such as sedition acts and war-time censorship.

The most volatile and controversial types of speech are political speech and religious speech. That's why they should be protected the most, because they are so controversial.

Congress would do well to stay out of the speech control business, especially trying to control the open and free discussion of America's two controversial and passionate pastimes, which are politics and religion. And besides, the